

REMARKS

In the Office action, claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of various references. Importantly, claims 3-6, 9, 12-14 and 17-18 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner has also allowed claims 19-22.

In this Response to Office Action, independent claim 1 has been amended to now include all of the limitations of the dependent claim 3 and dependent claim 3 has been canceled. The Examiner has indicated that such a claim would be allowable. To accommodate the cancellation of claim 3, claim 4 has been amended to now depend from claim 1.

Also in this Response to Office Action, independent claim 8 has been amended to now include all of the limitations of the dependent claim 9 and dependent claim 9 has been canceled. The Examiner has indicated that such a claim would be allowable.

Further herein, independent claim 15 has been amended to now include all of the limitations of the dependent claim 17 and dependent claim 17 has been canceled. The Examiner has indicated that such a claim would be allowable.

In addition, new independent claim 23 has been added and includes all of the limitations of original independent claim 1 and original dependent claim 6. The Examiner has indicated that such a claim would be allowable.

Also, new independent claim 24 has been added and includes all of the limitations of original independent claim 8 and original dependent claims 10 and 12. The Examiner has indicated that such a claim would be allowable. Dependent claims 13 and 14 have been amended to now depend from new claim 24.

Lastly, new independent claim 25 has been added and includes all of the limitations of original independent claim 15 and original dependent claim 18. The Examiner has indicated that such a claim would be allowable.

Amendments to the claims have been presented herein to improve the readability of the claims and to point out the features that distinguish the present invention over the cited art. Also, these amendments have been made to more clearly define the structure and cooperation of structure for the present invention. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-16, and 18-25 are now pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7-8 and 10-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rahbar-Dehghan (U.S. 6,587,197) and claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rahbar-Dehghan (U.S. 6,587,197) in view of Coffman et al. (U.S. 6,464,942). In addition, claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rahbar-Dehghan (U.S. 6,587,197) in view of Briggs et al. (5,560,811) and claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rahbar-Dehghan (U.S. 6,587,197) and Briggs et al. (5,560,811) and further in view of Malecki (4,587,213). Importantly, as indicated above, the Examiner has objected to claims 3-6, 9, 12-14 and 17-18 as being

dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner has indicated that each of these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the rejected base claim and any intervening claims.

In this Response to Office Action, dependent claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 17 and 18 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. With these amendments, all currently pending independent claims (i.e. claims 1, 8, 15, 23, 24 and 25) now include subject matter that the Examiner has indicated is allowable.

Accordingly, Attorney for Applicant respectfully contends that independent claims 1, 8, 15, 19, 23, 24 and 25, as amended, are nonobvious in light of the cited references. Further, since pending claims 2, 4-7, 10-14, 16, 18 and 20-22 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, 8, 15, 19 or 24, they are likewise allowable.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes the basis for rejecting claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome and the rejections should be withdrawn.

The references cited by the Examiner, but not relied on for the rejection of claims, have been noted.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-16, and 18-25 are patentable for the reasons set forth above, and that the application is now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at 619-688-1300 for any reason that would advance the instant application to issue.

Dated this 19th day of April, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



NEIL K. NYDEGGER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 30,202

NYDEGGER & ASSOCIATES
348 Olive Street
San Diego, California 92103
Telephone: (619) 688-1300



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: William Michael Lafferty)
Serial No: 10/084,552) Art Unit
Filed: February 25, 2002) 2877
For: GIGAMATRIX HOLDING TRAY)
HAVING THROUGH-HOLE WELLS)
Examiner: Zandra V. Smith)
Attorney Docket: 11335.2)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 19th day of April, 2004.

DEBRA D. BURNS
Legal Document Assistant

Transmitted: Response to the Office Action dated March 10, 2004.

oarespstd3-10-04:ddb